

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

9 LOIS WILLOW ALLEN,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 THE PERSONS WHO ACCESS MY  
13 PERSONAL NEURONS, *et al.*,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C17-1595-JCC

ORDER

15 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Lois Allen's complaint (Dkt. No. 1-1).  
16 Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"). (Dkt. No. 4.) Under 28 U.S.C.  
17 § 1915(e), district courts have authority to review IFP complaints and must dismiss them if "at  
18 any time" it is determined that a complaint is frivolous or fails to state a claim on which relief  
19 may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

20 It is not clear against whom Plaintiff brings suit. She names, in general, persons "who  
21 access my personal neurons and information be they in a computer or in my brain." (Dkt. No. 1-  
22 1). But a specific defendant need be named. That being said, she describes general misdeeds by  
23 McDonalds, Microsoft, Apple and Amazon in her complaint, but fails to state a cognizable legal  
24 claim against any. (*Id.*) As a result, Plaintiff's complaint fails to state a claim on which relief  
25 may be granted. Nor is the basis of this Court's subject matter jurisdiction clear from the  
26

1 complaint. Therefore, the complaint is also frivolous. *See Pratt v. Sumner*, 807 F.2d 817, 819  
2 (9th Cir.1987). Both deficiencies may be curable through amendment. *See Noll v. Carlson*, 809  
3 F.2d 1446, 1448 (9th Cir.1987). Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES Plaintiff's complaint (Dkt.  
4 No. 1-1) without prejudice.

5 DATED this 6th day of November 2017.

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26



John C. Coughenour  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE